

REMARKS

In the patent application, claims 1-26 are pending. In the office action, all pending claims are rejected.

Applicant has amended claims 1-10 and 21. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended to move some language in the preamble regarding the communication link to the characterizing part. Claims 1-10 have been amended to change the “communication device” to the “first communication device” and to change the “further communication device” to the “second communication device”. The first communication device is depicted as the recipient device 20 having an output module (the screen 22 in Figure 1a and Figure 2a; the speaker 60 in Figure 2b). The second communication device is depicted as the mobile phone 80 in Figure 1.

No new matter has been introduced.

Furthermore, applicant believes that the amendments do not require a new search or a new ground for rejection because the contents and the scope of the claims are essentially unchanged.

At section 3 of the office action, claims 1, 11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 because it is not clear which communication device has the output means for outputting the identity.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to replace the “communication device” with the “first communication device” and to replace the “further communication device” with the “second device”.

As depicted in Figure 1a, the recipient device 20 is a first communication device having a screen 22 for outputting the identity 40 of the recipient device 20. The mobile phone or sending device 80 is the second communication device. As described on p.6, lines 1-5, after the identification code 40 of the recipient device 20 is shown in the screen 20, the user can enter the identification code 40 into the sending device 80 in order to start the communication link between the recipient device 20 and the mobile phone 80.

Thus, in claims 1 and 11, the first communication device is the recipient device 20 and the second communication device is the sending device 80.

In claim 21, the communication device is the recipient device 20 and the further communication device is the sending device 80.

At section 4 of the office action, the Examiner states that claims 7-9 and 17-19 contain trademark/trade name Bluetooth.

As applicant pointed out in the amendment filed November 14, 2005, Bluetooth is not a trademark or trade name. Bluetooth is a Communications Standard, as with GSM in RF communications. More specifically, a Bluetooth system operates in the radio frequency range around 2.4GHz in the unlicensed Industrial-Scientific-Medical (ISM) band. Globally, the Bluetooth operating frequency falls within the 2400MHz to 2497MHz range. In the U.S. and in Europe, a band of 83.7MHz bandwidth is available and the band is divided into 79 RF channels spaced 1 MHz apart. Bluetooth network arrangements can be either point-to-point or point-to-multipoint to provide connection links among a plurality of electronic devices. The baseband protocol for a Bluetooth system combines circuit and packet switching. Circuit switching can be either asynchronous or synchronous. Up to three synchronous data (logical) channels, or one synchronous and one asynchronous data channel, can be supported on one physical channel. Each synchronous channel can support a 64 Kb/s transfer rate while an asynchronous channel can transmit up to 721 Kb/s in one direction and 57.6 Kb/s in the opposite direction. If the link is symmetric, the transfer rate in the asynchronous channel can support 432.6 Kb/s. Currently, each of the 79 RF channels is utilized by a pseudo-random hopping sequence through the Bluetooth bandwidth. In sum, Bluetooth is a known Standard in the communications industry.

For the above reason, applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 112 rejection.

At section 6 of the office action, claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "SONY" (Integrated Remote Commander: Operating Instructions, Document No. 3-048064674(1), RM-AV2100/AV2100B, © 2000 Sony Corporation).

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner states that SONY discloses a method of revealing an identity of a communication as claimed.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 has the limitation that the first communication device has means for outputting the device identity in a perceptually noticeable form, and the device identity in the perceptually noticeable form is outputted on said means. In other words, the identity of a communication device is displayed or outputted in a perceptually noticeable

form on the output means of the first communication device. As shown in Figure 1, the first communication device is depicted as the recipient device 20 having an output means (screen 22) for outputting the identity (identification code 40) of the first communication device 20 in a perceptually noticeable form. The mobile phone 80 is a second communication device. After the identification code 40 is shown on the screen 22, the identity 40 of the first communication device 20 is used to establish a link between the first communication device 20 and the second communication device 80.

In contrast, in SONY, the identity of a first communication device such as VCR123, is outputted in the perceptually noticeable form on the remote control, not on the outputting device of the VCR (the first communication device). The remote control is not part of the first communication device. Thus, SONY fails to disclose outputting the identity of a first communication on the output means of the first communication device in a perceptually noticeable form.

For the above reason, claims 1 and 11 are distinguishable over the cited SONY reference.

Regarding claim 21, the Examiner states that SONY discloses a communication device having a device identity as claimed.

It is respectfully submitted that in claim 21, the communication device is equivalent to the first communication device as claimed in claim 1, and the further communication device is equivalent to the second communication device. The communication device (the recipient device 20) has a storing device 54 for storing data indicative of the device identity of the recipient device 20 (see Figure 1a), and an outputting device 22 for displaying the identification code 40.

In SONY, the identity of a communication device such as VCR123, is outputted in the perceptually noticeable form on the remote control, not on the outputting device of the communication device. The remote control is not part of the communication device. Thus, SONY fails to disclose storing data indicative of the identity of the communication device and outputting the identity of a communication device on the output means of the communication device in a perceptually noticeable form.

For the above reason, claim 21 is distinguishable over the cited SONY reference.

As for claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-26, they are dependent from claims 1, 11 and 21 and recite features not recited in claims 1, 11 and 21. For reasons regarding claims 1, 11 and 21 above, claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-26 are also distinguishable over the cited SONY reference.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-26 are allowable. Early allowance of claims 1-26 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth Q. Lao
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 40,061

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955